



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/321,360	05/27/1999	MICHAEL F. GUHEEN	AND1P101	6371

7590 02/17/2004
MERCHANT & GOULD P C
POST OFFICE BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/321,360

Applicant(s)

GUHEEN ET AL.

Examiner

Akiba K Robinson-Boyce

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3623

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Due to communications filed 11/24/03, the following is a non-final rejection. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application and have been examined on the merits. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-18 are rejected. The previous office action has been withdrawn and the following action is in response to the amendment filed 11/24/03.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/24/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 3623

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of :

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible

result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful art" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claim 13 is directed to a system for displaying phases in which components of a system for providing a web architecture framework are delivered. Claim 13 recites the following: "**logic** for displaying a pictorial representation of an existing system including a plurality of components", "**logic** for presenting a first set of components of a system for providing a web architecture framework, the first set of components being indicia coded to indicate that they are to be delivered in a first phase", "**logic** for presenting a second set of components of a system for providing a web architecture framework, the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in a second phase". In this case, the **logic** represents a mere idea in the abstract since this **logic**

Art Unit: 3623

symbolizes software that is not tangibly embodied on a piece of hardware for use in processing the steps of the claim. Since the **logic** is software not tangibly embodied on a piece of hardware, or because there is no processor for completing the logic, claim 13 and all claims that depend from it are therefore found to be non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Rassman, et al (US Patent 4,937,743).

As per claims 1, 7, 13, Rassman, et al discloses:

displaying a pictorial representation of an existing system including a plurality of components, (Col. 2, lines 59-65, [information about available resources in a provided database is being graphically displayed], Col. 14, lines 13-16, Fig. 7, [shows how resources 123, 233, 224 {which represent components} are displayed]);

compiling a listing of additional components for implementation into the existing system/...compiles a listing of additional components for implementation into the existing system, (Col. 3, lines 7-11, [discloses that the resource

Art Unit: 3623

information in the database can be updated to have the most recent data

{resource information}));

determining a first set of the additional components for implementation in a first implementation phase/...determines a first set of the additional components for implementation in a first implementation phase, (Col. 4, lines 58-65, [resource information in the primary database], (Col. 8, lines 8-10, [shows primary resource is planned according to a given block of time {phase} represented by a "cell"]));

determining a second set of additional components for implementation in a second implementation phase/...determines a second set of additional components for implementation in a second implementation phase, (Col. 4, line 66-Col. 5, line 8, [resource information in the secondary database], Col. 8, lines 21-24, [shows secondary resource is represented by a "cell", which represents a given block of time {phase}]);

modifying the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the first set of components being indicia coded to indicate that they are to be delivered in the first phase/...modifies the pictorial representation of the first set of components being indicia coded to indicate that they are to be delivered in the first phase (Col. 3, lines 10-11, [displaying resource utilization for the most recent data after data in resource database is updated], Col. 6, lines 20-22 and lines 25-26, [shows that primary resources {first set of components} are displayed], Col. 14, lines 12-16 and Fig. 7, where the

Art Unit: 3623

components [represented by resources] for the first phase are indicia coded by the vertical rectangles labeled "Y" One for phase one)

modifying the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase/...modifies the pictorial representation of the existing system to show a pictorial representation of the second set of components being indicia coded in a manner unique with respect to the indicia coding of the first set of components to indicate that the second set of components is to be delivered in the second phase, (Col. 3, lines 10-11, [displaying resource utilization for the most recent data after data in resource database is updated], Col. 6, lines 20-22, lines 27-36, [shows secondary resources are displayed], Col. 14, lines 12-16 and Fig. 7, where the components [represented by resources] for the second phase are indicia coded by the vertical rectangles labeled "Y" Two for phase two);

As per claim 1, computer programs, code segment and logic are inherent with Rassman, et al's system because since he teaches that his method is carried out in a computer system, computer programs using code segments and logic is absolutely necessary for the computer to successfully process information and produce results.

The following is also inherent with Rassman, et al since this patent discloses the "management of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent resources using a computer system". In Web technology, a web architecture

Art Unit: 3623

framework consists of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent computer resources, both hardware and software. Therefore Rassman teaches:

a system for providing a web architecture framework...

As per claims 2, 8, 14, Rassman, et al discloses:

wherein a legend is presented which defines the indicia coding...(Col. 7, lines 11-18, Col. 8, lines 5-7 [indicia is being used to define an item]).

As per claims 4, 10, 16 Rassman, et al discloses:

wherein the components of the existing system are selected from the group of components including...customer-related services...(Col. 4, lines 36-42, Col. 5, lines 51-53, [hospital services are customer-related where the patient is the customer]).

As per claims 5, 11, 17, Rassman, et al discloses:

wherein the indicia coding is selected from the group of indicia coding including texture coding, color coding...(Col. 6, lines 11-5).

As per claims 6, 12, 18, Rassman, et al discloses:

wherein the step of displaying a pictorial representation of an existing system including a plurality of components also includes displaying additional components that may be implemented into the system, (Col. 3, lines 10-11, [displaying resource utilization for the most recent data after data in resource database is updated]).

As per claims 6, 12, and 18, the following is inherent with Rassman, et al since this patent discloses the "management of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent resources using a computer system". In Web technology, a web

Art Unit: 3623

architecture framework consists of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent computer resources, both hardware and software. It would therefore be inherent to incorporate hardware and software components of web architecture since they can be managed and visually represented as described in Rassman:

a system for providing a web architecture framework...

6. Claims 3, 9, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rassman, et al (US Patent 4,937,743) as applied to claims 1, 7 and 13 above, and further in view of Turnbull (US Patent 5,208,765).

As per claims 3, 9, 15, Rassman, et al fails to teach wherein the components of the existing system are selected from the group of components including operation services and developer services. Rassman et al would have utilized operation services and developer services with the motivation of accurately scheduling, monitoring and managing resources of the system.

However Turnbull discloses wherein the components of the existing system are selected from the group of components including operation services and developer services in Col. 2, lines 27-30 in an analogous art for the purpose of properly operating on and developing the product in order to indicate the completion status.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the components of the system from the group of components including operation services and developer services and incorporating these components from Turnbull into Rassman with the motivation of operating on and developing products so they can be successfully scheduled, monitored and managed.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claims 3, 9, 15, the following is inherent with Rassman, et al since this patent discloses the "management of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent resources using a computer system". In Web technology, a web architecture framework consists of a plurality of interrelated and interdependent computer resources, both hardware and software. It would therefore be inherent to incorporate hardware and software components of web architecture since they can be managed and visually represented as described in Rassman:

a system for providing a web architecture framework...

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is 703-305-1340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 703-305-9643. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7238 [After final communications, labeled "Box AF"], 703-

Art Unit: 3623

746-7239 [Official Communications], and 703-746-7150 [Informal/Draft Communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

QUB

A. R. B.
February 6, 2004



TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600